

REMARKS

By the present Amendment, claims 1-7 are cancelled and claims 8-25 are added. This leaves claims 8-25 pending in the application, with claims 8, 15, 20, 23 and 25 being independent.

Substitute Specification

The specification is revised to eliminate grammatical and idiomatic errors in the originally presented specification. The number and nature of the changes made in the specification would render it difficult to consider the case and to arrange the papers for printing or copying. Thus, the substitute specification will facilitate processing of the application. The substitute specification includes no "new matter". Pursuant to M.P.E.P. § 608.01(q), voluntarily filed, substitute specifications under these circumstances should normally be accepted. A marked-up copy of the original specification is appended hereto.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Original claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. By the present Amendment, the originally filed claims have been rewritten to avoid the language alleged to be indefinite in the Office Action. All language of the presently pending claims is now believed to be clear and definite.

Thus, the pending claims are definite and comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112.


Rejection Under 35 §103

New claim 8 combines the limitations of original claims 1 and 2 to constitute original claim 2 rewritten in independent form. New claim 15 combines the limitations of original claims

1 and 4 to constitute original claim 4 rewritten in independent form. New claim 20 combines the limitations of original claims 1 and 5 to constitute original claim 5 rewritten in independent form. New claim 23 combines the limitations of original claims 1 and 6 to constitute original claim 6 rewritten in independent form. New claim 25 combines the limitations of original claims 1 and 7 to constitute original claim 7 rewritten in independent form. Since original claims 2-5 are indicated as being allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, and to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, such claims, as presented herein, are allowable. The claims dependent thereon should also be allowable. The record will not be burdened with a detailed comparison of the claims and the cited patents.

In view of the foregoing, claims 8-25 are allowable. Prompt and favorable action is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark S. Bicks
Reg. No. 28,770

Roylance, Abrams, Berdo & Goodman, LLP
1300 19th Street, NW, Suite 600
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 659-9076

Dated: January 28, 2008